

cc. Judge R. W. Zobel
 for "HEARING 1. S. S. P.
 EXCL. S. S. OFFICE 3/3 - 3/10/05
 MARGETTA LANGLOIS PROSE
 VI.

MICHAEL HUBO -
 SAME S/ POLLACK -
 A. BERGER FLANDERS -

U.S. DISTRICT COURT 1:03
 04 C. V. 11588
 JUDGE R. W. ZOBEL

* REQUEST TO COMPEL COMPLAINT
ORDERS FOR MOTIONS "FOR DEFENDANTS"

First Judgments on
 All 3 Defendants ~~WITNESS~~ (AS AP)
 in "Open Court"
 RE: "Deadline of Discovery
 DATE 1/31/05 on Rec. Docket of C.V. 11588
 BEFORE JUDGE R. W. ZOBEL"

Discovery Needed from ~~10/21/04~~ on Rec. Rec.
Discovery Needed from 8/20/04 to Date 3/1/05

Nothing to Date - Q. to Date.
3 Def's Have Misled Plaintiff & Plaintiff Looks like
Fools * Plaintiff Needed "for Discovery"
By 3 - Defendants for

Depo's - 3/14/05 9:00 am.
 REQUESTED by Plaintiff.

(MOTIONS BE SET ASIDE BY COURT
Depo's) & (Orders for Defendants &
 First Judgments against all
 Discovery (w/ 3 Defendants & refusal of
 "discrimination" due to jail)
my case was never filed to
D.C. to collect
Statement of 6/15/04 - If

case had been corrected of
Deficiencies" by 1/18/03 & Plaintiff's to
3 Def. have "no evi. s. No Discovery
to prove to the Court their (3 Def)

ACTIONS WERE "ETHICAL" OR TO
PROVE TO JUDGE TO BE EXCEPT
FOR specifying JUDGE TO BE &
PLAINTIFF OR REGERY'S
PLAINTIFF WAS PROVED TO
THE COURT BY 3 DEFENDANTS
FINAL JUDGEMENTS W/ NO APPEAL
NO EXTENSIONS BY THE LAW!!!
ON DEFENDANT & BY THE
NEGIGENCE, INCOMPETENCE,
& APPROPRIATE
& GROSS NEGLIGENCE OF INNOCENT
COUNSEL & NOT ACTING AS
"ATTORNEY'S BIDING" BY THE LAW
& BEFORE JUDGE TO PROTECT
CLERK'S INTEREST W/ THE HATED
DAVIS TO TESTIFY — NO CLIENTS WERE
FAIRLY REPRESENTED & moves ~~THIS~~
ANY OF THE X-CIERS OF HABO —

LET IT BE KNOWN THAT
I HAVE LET D.C. CLAIMANTS
RECEIVE MY NAME, ADDRESS,
PHONE # TO THE EX-CLIENTS OF
(HOBs) & NOW ROLLICK & ANDERSON
IF w/ THEM
TO APPEAR BEFORE LIEN JUDGES
TO TESTIFY AGAINST HOBs, ROLLICK &
ANDERSON'S FALSE & MISREPRESENTATION
& GROSS NEGLIGENCE OF
IN EFFECTIVE COUNSEL w/ THE
"false," ^{by other} ~~that~~ CLIENTS ON THEIR CASES
FOR ALL - 3 DEF. TO
APPEAR IN PERSON, ALL 3 NOT 2
BEFORE LIEN JUDGES IN MONTGOMERY,
OR WHEREVER HEARING, JUDGMENT
3 DEF. TO THE EXTENT AS THE
COURT SHALL ~~DEEM~~ TO "EXALDION"
OF CLAIMANTS' CASES FAIRLY
Before Judge D. P. Hood. ~~or for a longer time~~
FOR "FINAL LIEN" ON D. C. CASE

MARGETTA LANGLOIS PRO. SE.

v.

Michael Hugo -
 Samuel Pollack.
 ALBERT FLANDERS.

FILED
 CLERKS OFFICE
 04-CV-11588-2
 JUDGE D.P. BROWN
 DISTRICT COURT
 MASS.

REQUEST - Court order

MOTION TO COMPEL BY PLAINTIFF

Set of #3 INTERROGATORIES
of 3 DEF'S (SEPARATELY, SIGNED, DATED)
 + 1 Copy To Court, + 1 Copy To Plaintiff
WITH 2 WKS. (4 DAYS) BY 1/15/05

1) To Date None answered By ALBERT
 FLANDERS OR SAMUEL POLLACK on REC.

1 or #2 - Set DEFAVITS & final
JUDGEMENTS - NEEDED - A.S.A.P.

2) No Discovery By all 3 DEF. None
 By 1/31/05 "DEADLINE" DEFAVITS &
final JUDGEMENTS - NEEDED ON ALL 3 DEF.
A.S.A.P.

3) Plaintiff HAS answered, Ad
 Interrogatories - from DEF. (all on record)

3 DEF. HAVE "NOT" Complied w/ Court's
 Demand 1/31/05 A.S.A.P. DEFAVITS &
JUDGEMENTS - NEEDED

c.c. U.S.D.A. CHINN, M.A.
 c.c. Hugo c.c. B.B.O.
 a.c. Pollack WEISBERG
 RE. 3 DEF.
 c.c. FLANDERS
 c.c. D.C. JUDGE S.P. HORN
 c.c. MS. HELEN DAVIS D.C. CHINN ASSIST. A.S.WITNESS

Margetta Langlois
 2/28/05 pro. se.

w/ D.C. FILE -

for 8713 DEFs. However, Above Not in (b)
 "COLLUSION" - POLLACK HUBO & FLANDERS.
 SEPARATELY, SIGNED &
 DATED.
 UNDER OATH AS ALL
 WERE SUPPOSED TO BE -

How many Times Above EACH DEF
 met w/ ms. MARGARET A LANGLOIS, in person
 from 1992-2005? (excluding, 2 court
 APPRENCES (Hubo + Pollack (not flanders
 DEF WITNESS) court 2x's).

- D. How many Times Did you HEAR from Plaintiff By LETTERS from. 1992 - 2005?
- 3). How many Times Did you HEAR from Plaintiff By LETTERS (in JAIL) 1997 - 1999 -
- 4) How many Times Did you HEAR from MARGARET A LANGLOIS AFTER Person 3
- 5). Did you 3 always answer Ms. Langlois - CALL WHILE in JAIL 1997 - 1999?
- 6). Did you file PAPERS in HER BEHALF IN Dow CHEMICAL CASE? (Not Dow Chemical Dow CHEMICAL?)
7. WHAT WAS "OUT-COME" of Dow CHEMICAL
8. Why? - IS IT STILL ACTIVE? WHO FILED IT?

"Originals" why did Att's Def.

"Ignore & Neglect" Do LETTER
To "CORRECT" DEFICIENCY? "OF" 1/18/03
WAS IT EVER CORRECTED?

By Hugo, Pollack, or Flunders
OR anyone under Hugo?
(Being head of firm.)

14) on my '03 NON EXISTING Contingency
Fee AGREEMENT since WHEN?

15) WHEN did Daniel Emmanuel Lewis
Leave firm - ?

16) I DID NOT EVER SIGN ANOTHER LEGAL
Bindng Contingency Fee AGREEMENT -
DID I? - w/ Hugo? —

A. w/ Hugo & Pollack?
B. w/ Hugo, Pollack, & Flunders?
C. w/ Pollack & Flunders?

17) How can Pollack & Flunders
obtain my file (without knowledge)
of ex-clients file after "break-up"
of Hugo's firm at David E. Lewis?

18) Who gave my D.C. file to Pollack &
Flunders?

19) How did Pollack & Flunders obtain

my files —

20.) ^{A)} Is Michael Hulio getting on (my
~~CASE~~) ^{B)} A "kickback" on EACH CASE
 From ~~Attacker & Attorneys~~ ?
 "UNDER OATH?" AS EVERYTHING IS
 SUPPOSED TO BE THE TRUTH
 BY AN 3 DEF — ON PAPER

21). Did you 3 DEF EVER contact
 DOW CARSONS — OR
 Michael Hulio's Firm BREAK-up?

22). Did you 3 DEF. Send "New
Contingency fee AGREEMENT"
w/ Plaintiff to D.C. w/ New firm or
Contingency fee AGREEMENT w/
TO OBTAIN Lien TO "EXCISE"
AND up service "THEORY" DUE TO
CLAIMANTS —

23) Will you (3 DEF) Be ATTENDING
Physically Before Judge Denise P. Hood
or HEARING on Plaintiff's Legally &
Legally on D. C. CLAIMANTS
Settlements? —

24). Plaintiff has put off "Physically"
HEARINGS Before Judge's hearing
HEARING w/ New
Contingency fee AGREEMENTS
Do any Exist w/ Plaintiff?

25) Do you 3 DEF have any "written" Consent —

"BROKE EACH OTHER" (How Flanders & Pollack) (Why Go Give Client's files over to Pollack & Flanders?)

- 25) Did Pollack & Flanders EVER SEND OUT LETTERS OR NOTIFICATION OF POLLACK & FLANDERS OBTAINING EX-CLIENTS OF MICHAEL MUGG'S FIRM CLOUDS?
- 26) WHO WROTE LETTER TO DON CORNINTO TO "OBSTIN" & WI WHAT PROOF WI HIS ADDRESS?
- 27) WI NEW ADDRESS?
- 28) WI NEW FIRM?
- 29) WI WHAT AND TO OBTAIN "FAKE, FAKE" & LEGAL LIES?
- 30) DID THE ATTORNEYS AT ~~HORN~~ OF POLLACK & FLANDERS EVER REPRESENT MARCETTA LANGFORD?
- 31) WHAT DID THE POLLACK & FLANDERS ATTORNEYS EVER SUBMIT TO D.C. "DEFICIENCY LETTER" TO CORRECT IT BY "SENDING ORIGINALS OF PLAINTIFF TO D.C.?" (AFTER 3/04?)
- 32) WHY NOT? BY POLLACK & FLANDERS

(Especially) Pollock knowing (he knew as of 11/18/03) "Deficiency -

34). To Pollock -

Why did you NEVER "CORRECT" 11/18/03 deficiency. EVEN AFTER TAKING file of Plaintiff on Rec. W/HUBO TO D.C.?

35) Did you Pollock & Flanders EVER send D.C. A LETTER of "New ATTORNEY" on REC? (AFTER 3/104 up to 4/14/04)
(14/04 - Fired?)

Plaintiff had TO LEGALLY FIRE AND 3' TO find out 2 more weeks - D.C. SAYS CASE WOULD HAVE BEEN LOST DUE TO "Deficiency" 11/18/03 & NEVER CORRECTED 5 1/2 mo. on REC. w/ D.C.
WHY NOT?

36). BECAUSE of P.O. Box 3091 Holiday Fls. 34690 - NEVER given to D.C. By any of 3ds? Given to HUBO'S office Nov. 99 - ON NEVER. But given to MARGIE in office of HUBO NEVER sent it into D.C. or left note to HUBO / or PAU Lawyer's to send to D.C. So CASE would be lost - DUE TO HUBO'S SEVERAL YEARS NOT

INTERESTED in D.C. on Rec by
Hubo himself

With whom & Plaintiff's
Claimants EVER notified of Lawyer
Change or who was
Being REPRESENTED by a IP LETTERS
were sent out by Hubo?
Pollack & Fladels

Before 03/04 (in RECK of)?

37) + How many
"YEARS" WAS Hubo NOT
"INTERESTED" in CASES?

38) When D.C. cases were notified
to an counsel were to
Send all claimants cases to?

39) BECAUSE cases were in STANDING
& Neglected by 3 def. COURT
not sent to D.C.
ON REC. BET BEFORE JUDGE RECEIVED
ON 10/21/04 & 2/16/05

Hubo & Pollack under oath
said THEY DID NOT know of "THEIR" &
OTHER claimants were - court have
RECEIVED money by 6/15/04
ON REC. w/ EVID -

So Pollack & Fladels still "Nagkond."
Cases to date by NOT FILING CLAIMS

Cases "IN THEIR Best Interests

TO Receive money DUE THEM,
SOME OVER 13 yrs -

DUE TO THE 3 DEF. NEGLIGENCE
& IN COMPETENCE WITH THE
"MALPRACTICE" OF
HUBO, POLLACK & FANDERS -
HAD ANY OTHER OF THEIR CLIENTS GOT MONEY
40).

How many women were REPRESENTED
IN HUBO'S FIRM - BY HUBO ^{up until} ~~up until~~ ^{BREAK}
~~up of~~ ¹⁹⁹²⁻⁰⁴ & BEFORE

How many FOR YEARS until settlement out? -
(No Names) (Exact Numbers)
TO BE ANSWERED is DEMANDED BY PLAINTIFF
BY ALL 3 TO ANSWER -

41). How many women collected while
HUBO'S FIRM - (HUBO REPRESENTED 1992-3/04 - ?

42). How many ^(WOMEN) have collected since
by POLLACK & FANDERS?

43). How many women have
FIRED HUBO in 1992-3/04?
(NUMBERS) (No Names)

44). How many women have TAKEN THEIR
FILES like Plaintiff did and fired

(10)

Pollock & Fluders -? To Date?

45) Were any Clients Notified where
THEIR files went in LETTERS with
HAD THEM?

46) Did THESE women also GET
"Am Bi's us" also when
THEY found OUT OTHERS got Settlements
AND YOUR Clients DID NOT?

47) THEY ARE Behind Plaintiff AT THE
BOTTOM of his Settlements
DUE TO HUBB & POLLOCK ON REC.
10/21/04
Before Judge Robel "No Clients
Cases filed Before D.C. up to
10/21/04 on REC.
IS THAT THE END?

48) To Date - Have HUBB?
Pollock?

Pluders?
(By my own work) - After I was "Accepted" 7/29/04 By D.C.
49) To Date - Have HUBB? Pollock? & Pluders?
Sent any Claims info?

50) A) AND Accepted WHEN?
B) w/ Proof and Complied Cases?
C) w/ New Contingency fee AGREEMENTS?

"")

D) WITH ALL NEW CLIENTS UNDER
THE NEW ATTORNEYS AT
LAW OF POLLACK & FLANDERS

E) WITH INVESTIGATORS FOR THE Plaintiff -
Victim - (MS. HELD STATUS OF HEAD OF
D.C. "EXPERT" CLAIMS ASSISTANCE
WITH ANSWER TO QUESTIONS &
PROOF OF ALL LIENS "THE LEGAL
W/OUT NEW & LEGAL AND C.R. RECORDS w/o
W/OUT CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS -

F) NEVER RECEIVED RULES TO FOLLOW TO
QUALIFY BEFORE TO DATE AND
TO QUALIFY FOR SETTLEMENTS

FOR PAYMENTS ON 6/15/04 IS THAT THIS (HUGO &
POLLACK TO ANSWER)
AND W/ ALL NOTICES TO COUNSEL'S

REGARDING SETTLEMENTS THAT

HUGO + POLLACK NEVER ALLEGEDLY

RECEIVED - ONCE AGAIN "PERJURY" IN

FRONT OF JUDGE ZOKEI -

W/ NOTICES SENT TO ALL ATTORNEYS -

ALL SET. ARE DEMANDED TO ANSWER
ALL QUESTIONS UNDER OATH & PENALTY
OF PERJURY - TO OVER(1) COPY(1) COPY TO
AMONTE

W/I IN 10 Days -

WITNESS List, ⁵⁰⁰ EXHIBITS, ¹⁰ Pictures on file
Ms. HELEN Davis will Be

Shown Into MTS. for Trial By
Jury on June 20 2005 9:00 am
& Show Back by Plaintiff w/

"Fee" TICKET I HAD TO PAY
25,000 miles TO receive

Plaintiff will Be looking
for "AU 3" ATTORNEYS will be
REMEMBERING Plaintiff w/ full

HOTEL ~~(room fare)~~ for TICKET in CASH w/ PAY
~~CAR~~ ~~EXPENSES - WITNESS fees for days~~
IN MASS. DUE TO WITNESS HAVING TO
COME FROM HOUSTON, TEXAS -

DUE TO AN "EMERGENCY"
& APPRECIATE -
Case could have NEVER
been "PROCESSED" - UP TO
4/14/04 ³¹ Lawyer is fired

Also

If Plaintiff - Victim has Received
Money & Prove "Delivery on
Att (S) Det.

C.C. KUBO, Plaintiff,
& Plaintiff's ^{Margotte Anglin}
C.C. Judge D. P. Hood ^{RECEIVED 3/28/05 Prose}
w/3D Det. Present on this